

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Matthew Heath,)	C.A. #2:17-1792-PMD-JDA
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
College of Charleston, et al,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the defendants' motion for summary judgment be denied. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). This matter was referred to the magistrate judge to review all pretrial proceedings and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.²

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this

¹Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(A), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in employment discrimination cases and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

²On June 27, 2018, defendants filed a Reply wherein they state that they do not object to the ruling of the Report and Recommendation.

case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is **ordered** that defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED without prejudice**.

FURTHER ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

July 6, 2018
Charleston, South Carolina